

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,522	01/04/2002	Charles Mehrmann	0675-037US1	7309
75	04/08/2003			
Leslie Meyer-Leon, Esq.			EXAMINER	
IP Legal Strategies Group P.C. 901 Main Street			BOTTORFF, CHRISTOPHER	
P.O. Box 280 Osterville, MA 02655-0280			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3618	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

- ;		Application No.	Applicant(s)
1.4		10/037,522	CHARLES MEHRMANN ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Christopher Bottorff	3618
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a		eet with the correspondence address
THE I - Exter after - If the	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reference of the communication.	l. 1.136(a). In no event, however, pply within the statutory minimur	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- Failu - Any r	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state eply received by the Office later than three months after the maind patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ite, cause the application to bed	ome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)🖾	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04	1 January 2002 .	
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final	
3)□ Dispositi	Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice unde on of Claims		
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the applicati	on.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	awn from consideration	n.
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requireme	nt.
Applicati	on Papers		
9) 🗌 .	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.	
10)🖾 ີ	The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 January 2002</u> is/ar	e: a)□ accepted or b)▷	objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)[]	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)∏ approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in	reply to this Office action	
12) 🗌 .	The oath or declaration is objected to by the f	Examiner.	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been receive	d.
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been receive	d in Application No
* S	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr application from the International E see the attached detailed Office action for a li	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2	!(a)).
14) 🗀 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for dome.	stic priority under 35 U	.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
) The translation of the foreign language packnowledgment is made of a claim for dome	• • •	
Attachmen	t(s)		
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 No	erview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) er:
S. Patent and To TO-326 (Re	rademark Office v. 04-01) Office	Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 6

Art Unit: 3618

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on April 5, 2002 has been considered by the examiner.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the concave and convex qualities of the side edges must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). Also, the asymmetrical quality of the side edges and the ends must be shown or feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Figures 4 and 5 show different dimensions for the trailing upturned bottom region 7c. In Figure 4, the dimensions of the trailing upturned bottom region 7c appear to be the same as the leading upturned bottom region 7b, which suggests that the upturned end portions are symmetrical. In Figure 5, the dimensions of the trailing upturned bottom region 7c appear to be different from the leading upturned bottom region 7b, which suggests that the upturned end portions are asymmetrical. However, the specification does not indicate that Figure 5 is the depiction of asymmetrical end portions. Applicants' assistance in clarifying the distinction between Figures 4 and 5 would be appreciated. For the purposes of examination, Figure 5 has been interpreted as depicting asymmetrical upturned end portions.

Art Unit: 3618

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szabad, Jr. US 4,850,913 in view of Wolf US 6,290,249.

Szabad, Jr. discloses a sliding device comprising an elongate member having a soft foam core formed of low density polyethylene material. See column 2, lines 12-22. A bottom surface of the elongate member has a slick skin, and an upper surface of the elongate member includes a traction material. See column 2, lines 3-11 and lines 23-51, and column 3, lines 13-18. Moreover, Applicants acknowledge this on page 5, lines 10-15, of the present specification. Szabad, Jr. does not disclose that the shape of the elongate member includes an intermediate portion with a substantially planar bottom region, two symmetrical or asymmetrical upturned end portions, symmetrical side edges, and wherein the soft foam core extends within the intermediate portion and each upturned end portion.

Art Unit: 3618

However, Wolf teaches a sliding device with the well known shape of an intermediate portion 16 with a substantially planar bottom region, two symmetrical or asymmetrical upturned end portions 18a and 18b, and symmetrical side edges 24a and 24b. See Figures 1-3 and column 2, lines 36-38. From the teachings of Wolf, forming the sliding device of Szabad, Jr. with the shape of an intermediate portion with a substantially planar bottom region, two symmetrical or asymmetrical upturned end portions, and symmetrical side edges would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. This would allow an operator to manipulate the device in a manner that is similar to the operation of a skateboard since the shape of the device mimics the shape of a common skateboard.

In regard to claim 11, Wolf also teaches that the material forming the central core of elongate member 12 extends within the intermediate portion and each upturned end portion. See Figure 2. From the teachings of Wolf, extending the core of Szabad, Jr. within the intermediate portion and each upturned end portion would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. This would allow the entire length of the elongate member to benefit from the core and slick skin structure.

In regard to claim 8, the examiner takes official notice that the practice of using asymmetrical side edges on a sliding device was old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Forming the side edges of the device of Szabad, Jr. with asymmetry would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so that the side edges would have distinct maneuvering

Art Unit: 3618

characteristics in specific locations, while maintaining normal maneuvering characteristics along other locations on the side of the device.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szabad, Jr. US 4,850,913 in view of Wolf US 6,290,249 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Spiers US D451,162.

Szabad, Jr. does not disclose a handle on the sliding device. However, Spiers teaches a sliding device with a handle. See Figure 1. From the teachings of Spiers, providing the device of Szabad, Jr. with a handle would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in order to give the operator greater stability and control while maneuvering.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szabad, Jr. US 4,850,913 in view of Hunter US 5,096,217.

Szabad, Jr. discloses the sliding device described above in regard to claim 1.

Szabad, Jr. does not disclose that the shape of the elongate member includes an intermediate portion with a substantially planar bottom region, two end portions, and side edges that are concave, convex, or asymmetrical.

However, Hunter teaches a sliding device with the well known shape of an intermediate portion with a substantially planar bottom region, two end portions, and symmetrical side edges that are concave and convex. See Figures 2 and 3, and note the convex shape of the side in region 4 and the concave shape of the sides in region 5

Art Unit: 3618

in Figure 3. From the teachings of Hunter, forming the sliding device of Szabad, Jr. with the shape of an intermediate portion with a substantially planar bottom region, two end portions, and side edges that are concave and convex would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. This would enhance the control and maneuverability of the device.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ahn, Pfeifer, Howarth, Jr., Johnston et al., Ritchie et al., Boatwright, Smith, Krafft et al., Ellman, Lavecchia et al., Mehrmann et al., Peart, Jeandin, Cummings, and Porte disclose sliding devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Bottorff whose telephone number is (703) 308-2183. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Johnson can be reached on (703) 308-0885. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Christopher Bottorff March 22, 2003

Chuth Botton